

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**  
**21st January 2015**

<u>UPRN</u>	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>Item No:</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
	15/P4308		06/11/2015
<b>Address/Site:</b>	7 Streatham Road, Mitcham CR4 2AD		
<b>Ward:</b>	Figges Marsh		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of a single storey side/rear extension and alterations to the roof, involving the erection of 1 x dormer window to the front roof slope, the enlargement of 1 x existing dormer on the side roofslope and the removal of 2 x chimney stacks		
<b>Drawing No.'s:</b>	2290/1, 2290/2, 2290/3, 2290/4, 2290/5, 2290/6 Rev B, 2290/7 Rev E, 2290/8 Rev D, 2290/9 Rev D		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Felicity Cox (020 8545 3119)		

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**Refuse planning permission.**

---

## **CHECKLIST INFORMATION**

- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Statement been submitted: No
- Press notice: No
- Site notice: Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 3
- External consultations: 0
- Controlled Parking Zone: No

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This application is being brought to the Planning Applications Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Geraldine Stanford.

## **2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The application site is located at 7 Streatham Road which is on the corner of Streatham Road and Graham Road. The site is located opposite Figges Marsh, a public park, and is situated slightly north of the intersection of London Road, Streatham Road, Lock's Lane and Eveline Road. The site is rectangular in shape and is occupied by a two storey (plus loft level) detached dwellinghouse. Due to the corner location, the host dwelling has two street frontages and a highly visible roofscape.
- 2.2 The dwelling is best described as 'Edwardian' in style and features a distinctive hipped roof with front, side and rear projecting gables, and three prominent chimney stacks. The Streatham Road elevation is considered to be the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, featuring bay and casement windows and providing pedestrian access to the dwelling. In comparison, the Graham Road elevation features minimal windows/openings and provides vehicular access to the garage at the rear of the site.
- 2.3 Two modest dormer extensions have been constructed on the south-west and south-east roofslopes, and a third dormer extension has been constructed on the north-east roofslope.
- 2.4 Adjoining the north-eastern boundary of the site along Streatham Road is a dental surgery (part of a semi-detached pair of houses); to the south-east of the site along Graham Road the site adjoins a row of terrace houses. The site is not located within a conservation area.

## **3. CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 This application seeks planning permission for a single storey side/rear extension and roof extensions, involving the erection of 1 x dormer to the front roof slope fronting Streatham Road, the enlargement of 1 x existing dormer on the side (north-east) roofslope and the removal of 2 x chimney stacks.
- 3.2 The proposed ground level extension would be located adjacent to the existing single storey outrigger at the rear of the dwelling house. The extension will have a depth of approximately 4.1m, width of approximately 1.9m and height of 3m. The walls will be rendered to match existing and the roof would feature clay tiling to match the roofing.
- 3.3 Roof extensions, each with a mansard roof are proposed either side of the gable fronting Streatham Road. The roof extensions will be visible from both Streatham Road and Graham Road and beyond from Figges Marsh. The extension would have windows to the south-west elevation (towards the Graham Road frontage).
- 3.4 The roof extensions will also involve the enlargement of the existing 'blind' dormer on the north-eastern roofslope, increasing the length of the dormer from approximately 2.8m to 5.9m. No windows are proposed to the dormer. The dormer will feature tile hanging to match existing.
- 3.5 It is understood from previous discussions with the applicant that the purpose

of the extensions is to provide additional living space for the applicant's disabled daughter, who requires a large amount of space for use of medical equipment.

- 3.6 The proposed roof extensions are identical to those refused under LBM planning application 14/P2865. No amendments to the design have been undertaken in response to the reasons for refusal (other than the addition of the ground level extension).

#### **4. PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 The planning history of the site is as follows:

14/P2865 – Erection of a dormer extension to the north/east side roof and erection of a new dormer to the south/east side roof – Permission refused on the following grounds:

**The proposed roof extension, by reason of size, siting and design, would result in a visually prominent and unduly dominant addition to the roofscape and would fail to respect or enhance the character and appearance of the subject property or the surrounding streetscene to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area. The proposals would be contrary to the objectives of policy CS.14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011) and policies DM.D2 and DM.D3 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014).**

10/P1580 – Erection of a 2-bed house on the site of an existing garage and rear store – Planning permission refused.

89/P0503 – Conversion of existing outbuildings to provide a 1 bedroom dwelling and erection of a garage for use by existing dwelling – Planning permission refused

88/P0403 – Alterations to property involving formation of side roof extension and side dormer window and installation of four windows and door in side elevation – Planning permission granted.

MER993/81 – Conversion of garage and outbuildings and erection of single storey extension to form single storey dwelling – Planning permission granted.

MER391/81 – Use of garage and outbuildings as a two storey house including the erection of a first floor extension over garage – Planning permission refused.

Other historic decisions between 1951 and 1981 including non-residential uses of building, erection of a garage, boundary walls and rooms in roof.

#### **5. CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 3 neighbouring properties were consulted by letters and a site notice was displayed. No representations were received.

- 5.2 Councillors:  
Councillor Geraldine Stanford – Cllr Stanford has not offered an opinion on the merits proposal but has asked that the application be considered by Committee.

## **6. POLICY CONTEXT**

- 6.1 NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework (2012):  
Part 7. Requiring Good Design
- 6.2 London Plan Consolidated (2015).  
7.4 Local character  
7.6 Architecture
- 6.3 Merton Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014).  
DM D2 Design considerations in all developments  
DMD3 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
- 6.4 Merton Core Strategy (2011).  
CS 14 Design
- 6.5 Supplementary Planning Guidance:  
Merton Council Supplementary Planning Guidance – Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions (2001).

## **7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 The planning considerations for an extension to an existing building relate to the impact of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host building along with the surrounding area and the impact upon neighbouring amenity.

### Character and Appearance

- 7.2 London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6, Core Strategy policy CS14 and SPP Policies DMD2 and DMD3 require well designed proposals that will respect the appearance, materials, scale, bulk, proportions and character of the original building and their surroundings. SPP policy DMD3 further seeks for roof extensions to use compatible materials, to be of a size and design that respect the character and proportions of the original building and surrounding context, do not dominate the existing roof profile and are sited away from prominent roof pitches unless they are a specific feature of the area.
- 7.3 The roofscape is a key characteristic of any building, and it is important that any roofscape assimilates effectively with the host building as well as the surrounding area to achieve a coherent design, thus protecting the visual amenity of the area.
- 7.4 The host dwelling has a unique roof form that features a primary hipped roof with front, side and rear projecting gables. Due to the site's prominence (being located upon a corner plot with extensive views from Figgis March to the

north and being bold in scale), the roofscape is highly visible from, and contributes significantly to the visual amenities of the streetscene and the wider area.

- 7.5 The proposal, which seeks to construct roof extensions either side of the front gable would significantly alter and dominate the roofscape. The development is to be located directly across one of the prominent roof pitches of the house and will result in conflicting roof styles, having a mansard roof above a subordinate gable roof attached to the primary hipped roof. The works would involve the removal of chimneys which contribute to the character of this property. The resulting roof profile would fail to respect the character, appearance or proportions of the host dwelling, to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area and the streetscene.
- 7.6 The proposed roof extension by virtue of its bulk, form, scale, design and resulting roof profile would constitute an obtrusive and incongruous form of development that would detract from the appearance of the original building and be out of keeping with, and detrimental to, the visual amenity and character of the area as a whole. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to the relevant planning policies listed above.
- 7.7 The ground level extension is single storey and significantly set back from the Graham Road frontage and adjoining terrace house to the south-east. Given its single storey nature, location on the site and overall size when compared to that of the host building, it is not considered that it would be detrimental to the building and surrounding area.

#### Neighbouring Amenity

- 7.8 SPP policy DMD2 states that proposals must be designed to ensure that they would not have an undue negative impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, quality of living conditions, privacy, visual intrusion or noise.
- 7.9 The ground level extension is sufficiently setback from the adjoining properties to not result in undue amenity impacts from overshadowing, loss of privacy or visual intrusion. The extension will be concealed behind the existing single storey outrigger, and therefore will not change the interface with the dental surgery to the north-east.
- 7.10 The proposal to extend the existing roof extension on the north-east roof slope has no windows and would result in a room with little natural light. However, it would not overlook adjoining properties and would therefore not result in a loss of privacy to the occupiers of the immediately adjoining property to the north-east, which is solely used for the purpose of a dental surgery. Given the presence of an existing roof extension on this roof slope, the extension is not considered to result in undue overshadowing or be visually intrusive on neighbouring properties.

- 7.11 The windows to the new front dormer will overlook Graham Road; however there is sufficient separation (27m) from the properties on the opposite side of Graham Road to not result in overlooking.

## **8. CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 The proposed roof extension by reason of its bulk, form, scale, design and resulting roof profile would constitute an obtrusive and incongruous form of development that would detract from the appearance of the original building and be out of keeping with, and detrimental to, the visual amenity and character of the area as a whole. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6, Core Strategy policy CS14 and SPP Policies DMD2 and DMD3.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Refuse planning permission on the following grounds:

The proposed roof extension by virtue of its bulk, form, scale, design and resulting roof profile would constitute an obtrusive and incongruous form of development that would detract from the appearance of the original building and be out of keeping with, and detrimental to, the visual amenity and character of the area as a whole. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6, Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy policy CS14 and Merton SPP policies DMD2 and DMD3.